UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/653,193	09/03/2003	Masami Maekawa	SUT-0225	1753

74384 7590 04/28/2009 Cheng Law Group, PLLC 1100 17th Street, N.W. Suite 503 Washington, DC 20036	**EXAMINER** PORTER, RACHEL L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/28/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action *Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief*	Application No. 10/653,193		Applicant(s) MAEKAWA, MASAMI
	Examiner RACHEL L. PORTER		Art Unit 3626

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>26 March 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

    a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

    b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

        Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

    (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

    (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

    (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

    (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

        NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

    The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

    Claim(s) allowed: *none*.

    Claim(s) objected to: *none*.

    Claim(s) rejected: *1-20*.

    Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: *21*.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See below.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

/C. Luke Gilligan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3626

Continuation of 11. Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Kameda does not meet the claim limitations because an operator performs the recited functions in the Kameda reference.

In response, the description of the applicant's own invention, (par. 50-51), discloses editing of the calendar by an operator and inputting patient information/patient names. The operator's involvement in the scheduling function is further disclosed in par. 56: "after completing the input of the patients' names and so on for the desired days, the operator instructs a start of scheduling." Applicant's specification further discloses that the operator may alter the time by dragging the procedure (par. 64-65) Therefore, the not all functions performed in the instant invention are performed by a computer program to the exclusion of a human operator.

Furthermore, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's interpretation of the Kameda reference. The system and method of Kameda is computer-implemented, and applicant has claimed a computer program for retrieving (fetching) data, and scheduling/creating a schedule. To the extent that an operator may be perform some steps in Kameda, the data retrieval and scheduling are performed using a computer, and therefore require a computer program.

The Strum reference, also computer-implemented, has been relied upon to disclose determining overlapping in time between procedures. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The Kameda and Strum references in combination were relied upon to address the claim limitations.

Moreover, it should be noted that language such as "…to avoid overlapping in time between timing of the medication and the examination for each patient …." describes the intended purpose or use of the step. It is not a positive recitation of a step that is performed in a method or (a step that a computer is configured to perform.)